

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 11, and 13-17 stand rejected as under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Goetz DE 41 38 479 in view of Perretta U.S. 5,063,845. With respect to claim 1, this rejection is overcome by the amendment of claim 1 to include the limitation of claim 4. With respect to claim 7, this rejection is traversed for the reasons following.

Goetz discloses a printing machine having individually driven cylinders and a controller for a precisely synchronized control of the cylinders. For a more detailed disclosure of the control in Goetz, see U.S. Patent No. 5,610,491. There is no disclosure of any means for braking the cylinders in the event of a web break.

Perretta U.S. 5,063,845 discloses an anti-wrap apparatus for a high speed printing press. A web break is not directly detected, but the wrap following a web break is detected by a wrap detector 26. This closes a micro switch 28 which activates a stop circuit 30 to de-energize the motors and apply the brakes (col. 3, lines 38-43). The wrap detector 26 is located as close as possible to the wrap cylinder 10 in order to de-energize the motors and energize the brakes before any significant amount of wrap occurs (col. 3, lines 43-50). Even then, additional measures are taken to break the web a second time to minimize the amount of wrap which can take place (col. 3, lines 55-63).

So the disclosure of Perretta is clear, that the de-energizing of the motors and the energizing of the brakes are separate operations achieved by separate mechanisms. Braking is not achieved by the motors; they are not brought to a standstill by a jerking stop by driving the motors along a stop ramp in a control program, as recited in applicants' claim 7. Since claim 7 distinguishes from the prior art, dependent claims 8-14 need not be addressed at this time.

Claims 4, 6, 10, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Goetz in view of Perretta and Hammond et al. U.S. 6,262,555. To the extent that this rejection would be applied to claim 1 as presently amended, it is traversed for the reasons following.

Goetz and Perretta are discussed above. Hammond et al. discloses a method of generating a braking torque in an AC induction motor by simultaneously applying two different frequencies to the motor when braking is desired. See column 2, lines 62-65. There is no suggestion of reversing the effective direction of torque produced by a motor. The examiner states that Hammond et al. teaches applying reverse braking torque, but the passage cited by the Examiner (col. 2, lines 25-38) does not suggest this.

The claims being definite and patentable over the art of record, withdrawal of the rejections and early allowance are solicited. If any objections remain, a call to the undersigned is requested.

It is believed that no fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the present application; however, if any fees or charges are required at this time, they may be charged to our Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 03-2412.

Respectfully submitted,

COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE

By



F. Brice Faller

Reg. No. 29,532

551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210

New York, New York 10176

(212) 687-2770

Dated: September 16, 2003